

RELIGIOUS SUICIDE IN THE VEDIC PERIOD (?)

The title of the paper is bound to arouse some curiosity, not un-mixed with doubt. The aim of the paper, however, is to kindle some fresh thinking about two problematic accounts from the Vedic texts. The first is the legendary account of the *yati*-s being devoured by the wolves (*sālāvṛka*-s), and the other one is the account of one Rahasyu Deva-malimluc, who is said to have killed the ascetics (*vaikhānasa*-s) at a place called Muni-maraṇa (« Death of the ascetics »).

To take the first. The legend of the *yatis* being devoured by the wolves comes about eight times in the Vedic texts; but it is not the same at all places. In certain cases the account is associated with Indra, stating that it is Indra who gave the *yatis* to the wolves; but at other places it is simply said that the *yatis* were being devoured by the wolves. The passages are as follows:

1. « Indra, indeed, gave the *yatis* to the wolves; as they were being devoured, Syūmaraśmi, a seer from amongst them, entered a horse (*teṣām adyamānānām syūmaraśmir ṛṣir aśvam prāviśat*); hence, does a horse smell its own excreta »<sup>1</sup>.

In this passage, Indra is said to have given the *yatis* to the wolves. The Taittirīya Sam. mentions Indra in the same context, but adds a ritual detail, when it states that the *yatis* were devoured by the wolves at the south of the northern altar (*dakṣiṇata uttaravedyā ādan*), by it supporting the throwing of the remainder of the cleansing (*prokṣaṇī*) water to the south of the northern altar. It is also said that by doing so whatever cruel there be in that quarter gets pacified (*yad eva tatra krūram tat tena sāmyati*)<sup>2</sup>. The Aitareya Br. refers to the giving of the *yati*-s to the wolves as one of the bad deeds of Indra<sup>3</sup>.

1. *Kāthaka Sam.*, VIII.5.

2. *Taittirīya Sam.*, VI.2.7.5.

3. *Ai. Br.*, VII.28.

2. As at the Taitt. Sam. (noted above), the northern altar and the southern quarter figure in the Kāṭhaka Sam.:  
 « The wolves, indeed, devoured the *yati*-s. As they were being so devoured, being clutched, they ran to the northern altar (*uttara-vedi*). That is why the wolves could not attack them. But, one of the *yati*-s, now, laughed (as the wolves were, thus, got rid off!); but, as he laughed, the wolves (again) ate them, one by one, dragging them. Hence one should not laugh thoughtlessly (or, fruitlessly, *moghahāsinā*)<sup>4</sup>.

In the account noted above, though the point held out appears to be that it is not good to laugh thoughtlessly, the importance of the northern altar is implied. The northern altar is the one that could save from death or danger, as against the southern quarter, which is cruel and has to be pacified. The motif is present at another place in the same text, where it is said that the northern altar is the place of birth, or of those that are born; it is also the place for those that are the « eaters »; the southern altar is the place of those that are to be « eaten »; hence it is that, the northern altar is to be scattered over with sand, and not the southern one. The passage starts with the legend of the *yati*-s being eaten by the wolves. About the two altars, it is also said, in the same context, that the northern altar is to be elevated (by scattering the sand), so that it could be mounted upon (*abhyārohāya*; for protection)<sup>5</sup>.

In the passages noted above Indra is not mentioned; and the account of the wolves and the *yati*-s starts straightway.

3. Yet another mention of the legend is in the context of the *kārīra*-ritual, a rain-charm. It is as follows: « The wolves, indeed, ate the *yati*-s; their (of the *yati*-s) heads fell off; they became the dates (*kharjurāḥ*); the juice of Soma that was (in the heads) got turned into the *karīra*-fruits, flying aloft; the *karīra*-s bring rain from heaven by being offered<sup>6</sup> ».

Hehe also Indra is not mentioned; and it would not be wrong to surmise that the motif of the wolves eating the *yati*-s is, originally, independent of all the accounts mentioned above. Evenso, the legend of the wolves and the *yati*-s must be very old and famous at the time of the formation of these various accounts, and was used to support certain details of the Vedic rituals, as *arthavāda*. The occasions to use the legend are, as noted above, the throwing of the *prokṣaṇī* water on the northern altar; the praise of the northern altar itself, saying that it is the altar for new birth, as against the southern one, which indicates death; and the praise of the *karīra*-fruits and the dates. The comparison of the dates

4. Kāṭhaka Sam., XXV.6.

5. Ibid., XXXVI.7.

6. Ibid., also XI.10.

with the heads of the *yati*-s also indicates that the *yati*-s had their heads clean shaven, as against those of the *muni*-s, who had long flowing hair<sup>7</sup>. The same is also indicated by the detail that one of the *yati*-s, the seer Syūmaraśmi, enters the horse and is indicated to have come out as its excreta which it smells<sup>8</sup>. That Indra gave the *yati*-s to the wolves has also to be taken as an *arthavāda*, and not a matter of fact; nor can it be taken as an effort of some so-called Aryan chief punishing the *yati*-s with this cruel fate. It is also to be noted that Indra often comes in rituals only as an indication of divine participation; and many rituals where such divinities as Indrāṇī, Vṛṣākapi and others are said to take part in acts or rituals indicate only this divine participation, the act being accomplished by mortal agents turned divine on the plane of the sacrifice or ritual<sup>9</sup>. What, then is the nucleus of the accounts involving the wolves, and the *yati*-s? The main points can be sorted out as under:

1. The *yati*-s were devoured by the wolves; but they were not offered to them by any enemy.
2. It is probable that they, or some of them, offered themselves to be so devoured, and that they did so in a group; some of them ran away when actually the wolves came, but others, as a rule, did not.
3. The smile of one of the *yati*-s did not stop the wolves from eating them; it appears to be misinterpreted as that of a person who has duped the wolves; it is not improbable that the smile was in spite of the wolves eating them; if so, it indicates complacency.
4. As an off-shoot of the previous point, it could be added that the *yati*-s were revered for this act of theirs; respect for them is clear in the fact that their heads are said to serve, in the form of the *karīra*-fruits, to bring rain in a Vedic ritual; at other places *yati*-s are said to be not particularly enemies of Indra<sup>10</sup>.
5. If what is suggested above is accepted, it appears that the *yati*-s were devoured by the wolves (or offered themselves to them) on the southern quarter of a locality<sup>11</sup> (cf. the motif of the northern and the southern altar).

7. RV X.136.7, *Kaśi*; cf. AV VIII.6.17, *munikeśa*, epithet of an evil spirit.

8. *Ibid.*, VIII.5; cf. BHAVABHŪTI, *Uttararāmacaritam*, IV.26; *vikirati śakṛt-piṇḍakān āmrāmātrān*; this may give the idea of a miniature head.

9. SADASHIV A. DANGE, *Sexual Symbolism from the Vedic Ritual*, Delhi, 1979, esp. pp. 51-82.

10. RV VIII.6.18<sup>ab</sup>, *yā indra yātayas tvā bhṛgavo yé ca tuṣṭuvūh*; here the Bhṛgus are different from the Yatis; also *ibid.*, 3.9<sup>cd</sup>; X.72.7 for the praise of the yatis for nourishing the worlds.

11. The reason is that this quarter is associated with the dead, and also with no return; cf. *Satapatha Br.*, III.1.1.2, *eṣā vai dik pitṛnām*; *sa yad dakṣiṇapravaṇam syāt* (i.e. the altar) *kṣipre ha yajamāno anum lokam iyāt*; cf. also I.2.5.17; II.3.3.16; III.2.3.17.

From what has been said above, it is not improbable that the *yati*-s, who have been known even to the R̥gvedic seers as wandering ascetics<sup>12</sup>, came to a particular place, when completely emaciated, as the last resort and with a determined mind to meet their last fate. The wolves (or dogs, the word is *sālāvṛka*) might be knowing the place by habit. The *sālāvṛkas* are referred to twice in the R̥gveda, and the references appear to show acquaintance with the custom of offering persons to them, or, at least, the beasts so devouring. In one place Indra is said to have held a thousand *sālāvṛka*-s by the mouth<sup>13</sup>, while at the other, Purūravas refers to them comparing them with the hearts of women<sup>14</sup>; it is also said that he may be eaten away by the wolves<sup>15</sup>. The point that strikes one here is, why should Purūravas not refer to any other type of bodily affliction, when being denied the attention by Urvaśī. True, that the customs of the disposal of the dead referred to in the R̥gveda do not include the giving away to the wolves; but, there can be no doubt that Purūravas is referring to the most grotesque bodily torture in his mention of the wolves devouring him. The words of advice to Purūravas are: « Purūravas! Die not (*mā mṛthāh*); fall not: may not the vile wolves (*vṛkāso āśivāsaḥ*) devour you. Friendships with women are non-existent; they are the hearts of the *sālāvṛkas* »<sup>16</sup>. In the earlier verse, falling to the ground is closely associated with the devouring by the wolves; it precedes the eating by the wolves<sup>17</sup>. The wolves are, here, described as *rabhasāsaḥ*, « speedily attacking »; and, as noted above, they are described as *āśiva*, « inauspicious ». These details could not have been without an actual observation. In the passages noted earlier, Indra's agency in the act of the wolves devouring the ascetics is not inherent; and we have given reasons for believing so. Again, in the face of the fact that the *yati*-s praise Indra, as noted above<sup>18</sup>, there can be no doubt that the eating of the *yati*-s by the wolves, though it appeared to be terrible, was customary for the *yati*-s themselves. In this connection it will be interesting to know that, among a sect of Jains, the dead were given to the jackals; and different superstitions were based on the direction in which the body was carried by the beasts. If the body was dragged without injuring it, the direction in which it was dragged was believed to offer good prospects for alms and sojourn. If the body was injured while being dragged, it was indicative of famine in that direction. The prediction was applicable only to the bodies of the preceptors; in the case of others no such predictions were made<sup>19</sup>.

12. Soma is described as *sahasra-ñitir yatīḥ*, « going in thousand paths ».

13. RV X.13.3.

14. *Ibid.*, X.95.15.

15. *Ibid.*, also 14.

16. *Ibid.*, X.95.15, *Sālāvṛkāṇām hṛdayāny etā*.

17. *Ibid.*, 14, *ādhā sāyita niryter upāsthe ādhainam vṛkā rabhasāso ādyūḥ*.

18. *Ibid.*, VIII.6.18, *Yā indra yātayastvā... tuṣṭvūḥ*.

19. S. B. DEO, *History of Jain Monachism*, Poona, 1956, p. 431, where he cites from the *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*.

In another case, a future Sākya Muni is reported to have offered his body, being alive, to a hungry tigress<sup>20</sup>. These instances may be from a later period; and similar other instances from the Vedic texts may not be available; but their near absence in that period cannot be granted simply because the texts do not record them. In the case of the Vedic *yati*-s, such a custom cannot be said to be improbable. The probability is of its prevalence, the *yati*-s being living and getting emaciated prior to the offering, as a religious duty; or, the bodies might have been offered to the wolves, if they died in their act of a solemn vow.

Another ticklish account, which has dodged the efforts for satisfactory interpretation, is where the *vaikhānasa*-s are said to have been killed by a certain Rahasyu called Deva-malimluc. The account has a very restricted occurrence<sup>21</sup>. According to the account in the Jaim. Br., *vaikhānasas* are said to be « seers » (*ṛṣīkāḥ*) and beloved of Indra. The name of the « killer », however, is Rahasyu Mārimlava. Indra desired to see the *Vaikhānasa*-s, and approached Rahasyu. When he asked Rahasyu whether he saw the *vaikhānasa-ṛṣis*, the latter (pointing out to himself) said that « he » (meaning himself) killed them<sup>22</sup>. Indra was glad that Rahasyu owned the guilt. The plea of Rahasyu was that he would have acquired both the sin of killing and falsehood, had he told a lie; now that he had told the truth, he only had the burden of the killing (*sa hovāca anṛtam ca bhrūṇa-batyāñ ca-ud ayāmsam; tad anṛtam evāyāsīt*). The account goes on to say that Rahasyu was asked by Indra to choose a boon, for he spoke the truth. Rahasyu asked for a *brāhmaṇa* as his son. The boon was granted; and it is said, that the progeny of Rahasyu came to be Takṣu-s (or Takṣavas; there are two readings: *takṣavaḥ*; and *taksavāḥ*). The gods questioned Indra, how in spite of him Mārimlava killed the ascetics<sup>23</sup>. Indra thought that the ascetics should be brought to life; hence he composed the *sāman*, which came to be known as *Vaikhānasa*, as he himself was *Vikhanas* (*indro ha vai vikhanāḥ*). The *Vaikhānasa sāman* is praised, here, as being a medicine (*bheṣajam*) and also an expiation (*prāyaścittiḥ*). The account at the *Pañcaviṃśa Br.* is shorter; and, though it is about the same, certain details are different. Apart from the name of the killer appearing as *Malimluc*, the latter is said to have killed the *vaikhānasa*-s at a place called *Munimarāṇa*. The gods knew that the ascetics were dear to Indra; (and, not seeing them) they asked Indra what had happened to them. Indra went in search of the ascetics; but could not find them.

20. J. HASTINGS, *Encl. Rel. and Ethics*, vol. XII, p. 26, where reference from the *Jātakamālā*, SBE, vol. I, occurs.

21. *Pañcaviṃśa Br.*, XIV.4.7; *Jaiminiya Br.*, III.190.

22. The expression is, *sa hovāca syo vai bhagavas tām amārayad iti*; also W. CALAND, *The Brāhmaṇa of the Twentyfive Chapters*, Calcutta, 1931, on XIV.4.7, p. 358, note 2, where he refers to the *Jai. Br.*, « It is I who have killed them, O Bhagavan ».

23. *Mārimlavo animarat*; the verb is to the taken in the casual sense; cf. *ajijanat*, RV IV.53.2; V.83.10 etc.

He, then, clarified the worlds by a single unabated effort<sup>24</sup>, and found them at (the place called) Muni-maraṇa (« Ascetics-Death »). He revived them by means of the Vaikhānasa laud. That was his sole desire at that time; hence, it is said that the Vaikhānasa laud<sup>25</sup> is the « Desire-fulfilling » laud.

It will be clear that the motive for the employment of the account at the two texts is different, being at one place called the *bheṣaja*, and, at the other, fulfilment of desire. Evenso, the aim is the same viz. activating or setting to motion the ascetics. Nothing further is known about the ascetics; and there is no other appendage to the account to clarify the point. From the mood of Indra reflected in the account, the *yati*-s may be believed to have regained their (divine) life. The *sāman* is a *bheṣaja*; and its application would only prove the same point. There can be little doubt that the legend is ancient and independent of Indra, like the other one studied above (i.e. of the *yati*-s and the wolves). Indra is ushered in as a general emancipator, or hero, as is the case in the earlier account and at other places. Another point to be noted is that the place where the ascetics are said to be killed is named Muni-maraṇa in one account (Pañc.Br.) though the other account is silent about it. The name suggests that the place is so called not because the ascetics were killed there, but because they died there. In the former case, we expect the name to be Muni-māraṇa. Again, the name appears to be indicative of a continued and known practice, rather than a solitary event<sup>26</sup>. The adjunct of the detail of the ascetics regaining their life (cf. *enān samairayat*, Jai.Br.; and *tān...samairayat*, Pañc.Br.) works two ways. In the first case it indicates the belief that such a death is only temporary, and a step to the next divine birth; and, on the other, it serves as a commendation of Indra and the laud.

Now, about the « killer » Rahasyu Deva-malimluc/Mārimlava. The name Rahasyu occurs at both the places; but there is a difference regarding the other: Deva-malimluc at the Jai.Br., and Mārimlava at the Pañc.Br. Evenso, at both the places the gods appear to be keenly concerned about the death of the *vaikhānamas*; in one they directly ask Indra about the fate of the *vaikhānasa*s; and, in the other, they gather

---

24. *Ekadhāreṇa*; *Sāyaṇa*, *ekodyogena*; for CALAND « the exact meaning of the purificatory process by one stream is difficult ». Probably, *eka* has the sense of « mighty » or « excellent »; cf. *śatapatha*, Br. I.16.4.12, *eko viraḥ*; Jai. Br., II.156 (for Indra), *ayam na eko viro 'bhūt*; also RV I.31.5, *eka-āyuh*, said of Agni; also X.103.3, *ekaviraḥ* (Indra); VII.38.5, *ekadhenubhiḥ*; *dhāra* (masc.) may be understood as indicating a unique method, fr.  $\sqrt{dhṛ}$ , « to hold »; cf also *dhārapūtāḥ* (Ādityas) at II.27.2; 9; *dhāra-vāka* at V.44.5. The expression *ekadhāreṇa* may also mean « by a sudden torrent of rain », Indra being the rainer.

25. The laud (*sāman*) is on RV VIII.31.17, *nākiṣṭām kārmanā naśat nā prā yoṣan nā yoṣati*, and has the strain of excellence and non-separation; the latter suits the present context.

26. *munimaraṇe amārayat* and *munimaraṇe avindat*.

round him to question how, in spite of him, they were killed<sup>27</sup>. The name Devamalimluc is explained by Sāyaṇa thus: «surpassing the gods and rendering them lustreless»<sup>28</sup> where *mali* is taken as a noun, «dirt» or «blackness». But, the rendering has to be discarded, in view of the other word, *mārimlava*<sup>29</sup>. Both the words are connected with killing, as is clear from the passages<sup>30</sup>. There is no other variation of the name Malimluc in relation to the legend of the *vaikhānasas*; but we have another similar word, Malimluca, which refers to the extra month, which is also called Samsarpa, Sanisrasa and Amhasaspati<sup>31</sup>. The point is, why should the month be called Amhasas-pati, «Lord-of-sin»? The names Saṁsarpa and Sanisrasa (fr.  $\sqrt{sam} + sṛp$  and  $\sqrt{sra} + nis$  respectively, the latter being the frequentative) indicate swiftness of gait; and the extra month being the thirteenth, and coming once and vanishing for the next three years, is justly described by this epithet. A deeper thought shows that the name «Lord-of-sin» corresponds to the concept behind the word Deva-malimluc, «God-killer». The month is characterised, technically, by being side-tracked and crossed over by the sun<sup>32</sup>, which seems to be the reason why it is characterised as inauspicious (*amhasaspati*); and the epithet «God-killer», probably, is symbolic (as its having thus, avoided-«killed»-the Sun-god?). The surmise gets support from the later tradition, which mentions the ancient name Malimluca for this month, and ordains that no ritual auspicious to the gods or to the manes should be performed in this month; this is because this month is tinged with sorrow. Hence also, a vow named Śoka-vināśana («Destroyer-of-sorrow») is enjoined in it<sup>33</sup>. The suggestion of J. Narten, who has studied the word Devamalimluc along with Malimluc and Ma-

27. *Pañca. Br. (loc. cit.) tam edvā abruvan kva tarṣayo'bhūvann iti; Jai. Br. satas tavo (= tava + u).*

28. *devān mālinyam mlocayati iti devān atigaḥ.*

29. CALAND, *loc. cit., op. cit.*, does not read *Mārimlava*, when he provides his translation from the *Jai. Br.* in the note; but only Malimluc. His text and version of the *Jai. Br.* is not indicated.

30. *Mārimlava* is from *Marimlu*, the meaning not changing, the suffix (*aN*) being *svārthe*. *Marimlu* and *Malimlu* have the same root  $\sqrt{mr} \sim mṛ$ , relating to death or injury; the varieties would be *Marimṛ*, *Malimṛ*, *Mariml*. The word *maliml* comes with *stena*, and has to be differentiated from the latter; hence, it does not denote only «thief» or «robber», but «dacoit» or «killer».

31. See A. A. MACDONELL and A. B. KEITH, *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, under *māsa*; *Vājasaneyi-Sam.*, 22.30; 7.30, *Maitrāyaṇī Sam.*, III.12-13; AV V.6.4; *Kāthaka Sam.*, 35.10; 38.14. The later texts make a difference between *Amhasaspati* and *Samśarpa*; see P. V. KANE, *History of Dharmashastra*, vol. V-i, p. 672.

32. Cf. *Skanda Purāṇa*, V.1.60.33 (*sūryeṇa*) *asaṅkrānto yadā māsaḥ*; also KANE, *op. cit.*, p. 671, n. 1053, where he quotes from *Laghuhārīta*, *tam atikramya tu ravir yadā gacchet kathaṁ cana*. This month is called *Puruṣottama*, according to certain *Purāṇas* (KANE, *op. cit.*, p. 672, where he refers only to the *Padma P.*, VI.64); and some mention *Puruṣottama* as the lord of this month. The idea seems to be to do away with the evils attached to this month; the special ritual at this time requires the worship of Viṣṇu (*Puruṣottama*) with Lakṣmī; see note 33 below.

33. For this vow see *Skanda P.*, *loc. cit.*, 19-21; 33-38.



rimlu, that there is an indication of the extra month being regarded as a demon<sup>34</sup>, is acceptable. With the traditional belief regarding the Malimluch month, one feels that the Vedic Deva-Malimluc is only a personification of this month; and the name Rahasyu is symbolic of its mysterious behaviour of coming out of the set yearly norm. The later name Malamāsa for this month appear to be a corruption, or it may be a new name. There is no sufficient ground to believe that the original word *mali* (in Malimluc), like *mala*, indicated dirt; and the suggestion that *mali* is only another form of *mala* is unwarranted<sup>35</sup>. The epithet «poisonous» is also added to Malimluca<sup>36</sup>, which does not particularly support the suggestion of *mala*, but indicates killing. The belief about the anthropomorphism of the months is already proved by their being addressed in the texts mentioned above. Actually, the extra month was believed to be a vile person from whom the Soma-plant was to be purchased<sup>37</sup>. This reference to a month, called often Malimluca<sup>38</sup>, indicates an ancient originally prevalent practice of purchasing the Soma-plant in this particular month<sup>39</sup>.

The truth behind the account of the *vaikhānasas* and Rahasyu Malimluc (Mārimlava) appears to be that the *vaikhānasas* believed in giving up their life in the thirteenth month, with the hope of a new divine life. This is clear in the point that Indra brought them to life again; and the

34. JOHANNA NARTEN, *Malimlu-malimluca*, IJJ, IX-iii, 1966, pp. 203-8; *Schaltmonat Dämon*.

35. The name Malamāsa is explained as follows: «They say that it is the dirt of Time», *malam vadanti kālasya*, quoted by KANE, *op. cit.*, p. 671, 1052. Mahidhara's comment, on Vāj. Sam., XI.78, *malimlūn*, as *malinā bhūtvā mlocanti*, is grammatically unsound; even granting that *mali* (*malin* = *mal+in*) is an adjective, it has to be an object of the verbal formation (*kr̥danta*) *mluc*. Actually, the word is *malimlu*, both here and at 79. KANE cites RV X.136.2, *mūnayo Vātaraśanā piśāṅgā vasate mālā*, *op. cit.*, 671.

36. *Sāṅkhāyana Śr. S.*, VI.12.15, *malimluco'si sagaraḥ*.

37. *Aitareya Br.*, III.1, *tam trayodaśān māsād akriṇan*.

38. *Kāṭhaka Sam.*, 38.14, *malimluco nāmāsi trayodaśo māsah; indrasya śarmāsi*.

39. Why the Soma-plant was purchased in this month is not quite clear; or, at least, why it is associated with the thirteenth month! Probably, the detail could be compared with the status of the Soma-plant in ritual-context. The Soma-shoots are arranged in the shape of a man, prior to their being pressed; and the pressing of the Soma-shoots is seen as the killing of King Soma; cf. *Satapatha Br.*, III.9.4.2; 17; *Maitt. Sam.*, IV.7.7; 8.3 etc. The ritual-symbolism in Soma-pressing is of death and re-birth, the latter when the pressed shoots are placed in the Vasativari waters (see EGGELING, *Tr. Sat. Br.*, SBE, 26, p. 244); and it is based on the monthly movement of the moon and the sun. The Sun-Indra is always the «Eater» and Moon-Soma is always the eaten, *Satapatha Br.*, I.6.4.12 ff. The nature of the thirteenth month as the Amhasaspati and Malimluc (-a) seems to have, in addition, the germ of new birth, taking into account that Indra brings the *Vaikhānasas* back to life. The killer and the new-birth-giver in one is also the nature of the sun; the same is true of the preceptor in relation to the disciple or the initiate; on this point, see DANGE, *Legends in the Mahābhārata*, Delhi, 1969, pp. 171-90. This would show Malimluc(a) in a new light — the beneficent month-demon — and would help the custom of religious suicide in it for a divine fresh birth.



month is said to be *indrasya śarma*. The two accounts analysed here would have, then, to be taken as the earliest indications of religious suicide, the later forms of which were the *samlekhana* of the Jains and the *Bhṛgupatana*<sup>40</sup> and other methods of the Hindus. The Aryans following the Vedic sacrificial cult did not follow this method; and though they appear to be rather shocked by this terrible method they had no disrespect for the *yatis* and the *vaikhānasas* who followed the life of the ascetics.

---

40. *Manusmṛti*, VI.31-32; *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, III.55, and the *Mitākṣarā*.